



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,876	03/30/2001	Martin Thoone	01719055	7131

26565 7590 09/20/2005

MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
P.O. BOX 2828
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2828

EXAMINER

POLTORAK, PIOTR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,876

Applicant(s)

THOONE ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Poltorak

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment, and remarks therein, received on 6/16/2005 have been entered and carefully considered.
2. The Amendment introduces a new limitation into the original independent claims 1, 24 and 39, and dependent claims 25-29, 33-34 and 36-37. The new search has resulted in newly discovered prior art. New grounds of rejection based on the newly discovered prior art follow below.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but they were not found persuasive.
5. In this response the examiner attempts to address applicant's concerns as diligently as possible. However, applicant's invention consists of three separate embodiments (although overlapping in a few claims), and the arguments as presented are not necessarily understood completely. Applicant makes general statements without clearly specifying the particular claims that these statements are relevant to and it appears that Applicant is arguing limitations not found in the claims. For example, applicant argues that Brunt is characterized as a maples navigation system and as a result Brunt does not disclose map data.

The examiner reminds applicant that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

6. As a result the examiner addresses applicant's argument as best understood.
7. Applicant argues that *Brunt's* system does not allow selective access to different files on a storage medium and is not a user entered identification code.
8. The requirement of a storage medium to be a user entered identification code is not found in the claim language and *Brunt* is discussed in regard to claims 1-23. In addition claims 1-23 are directed to "a selected file from a group of files".
9. Applicant argues that *Cooper* does not disclose a key which may be used to access two or more files from a collection of files in addition to using a key for the storage medium itself.
10. The examiner points out that a recitation directed to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be used (*e.g. to using a key for the storage medium itself*) does not distinguish the claimed apparatus from the prior art the if prior art has the capability to so perform. The examiner acknowledges that use of such a language only requires that a key have the capability to perform a particular function not that it actually performs it. Accordingly, nominal consideration has been given to such limitations.
11. Furthermore the examiner points out that that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "two or more files from a collection of files) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations

from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In particular claim 1 recites a selected file from a group of files.

12. Similarly claim 24 is directed towards the selected group of files, which are a subset of files and the examiner points out that a single file could satisfy the claim limitation since a subset of files can consist of one file.
13. However, taking into consideration applicant's intention as well use of the verb "are" in "selected group of files which are a subset of files" the examiner treats the limitation of claim 24 as directed towards "one or more files".
14. Applicant argues that Wehrenberg does not relate to selectively protecting different files, but relates to encrypting different units of data block that make up a bigger file.
15. The examiner points out that during the examination the limitation on lines 3-4 of claim 24 has been read as: "calculating a key (k) using a storage medium device identification number (ID) and a first scrambled code (PIN) by a computer system" and the limitation on lines 7-8 has been read as: "enabling access to the selected group of files using a generated identifier by the computer system".
16. Also, the limitation of claim 34: "wherein the vector for the device identification number is changed whenever a file has been enabled" was interpreted as: "wherein the device identification number vector is changed whenever a file has been enabled".
17. The examiner suggests that applicant articulates claims 24 and 34 as discussed in paragraphs 15-16.

18. As noted above in paragraph 10 the examiner gives nominal consideration to the limitation of the intended use of the key cited in claim 24. Even if applicant was to explicitly define the device identification number (ID) as “a storage medium device identification number (ID)” *Kambayashi et al. (U.S. Pub. 20020002466)* teach and provides motivation to calculate a key with a device identification number (ID) for the storage medium [e.g. *Kambayashi et al.*, 79].
19. However, if “a storage medium device identification number (ID)” was used in calculating a key (k) it **would NOT have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention** to implement “the vector change for the storage medium device identifier by multiplying it by a change vector c, so that $ID(i)=ID(i=1)*c$ is true after a file has been enabled for the i-th time” as required by claim 34.
20. Lastly, the examiner reminds applicant that while amending claim language no new matter is allowed and encourages applicant to supply support for any amendments in the specification.
21. On pg. 13 applicant also suggests that *Brunt’s* system does “not allow selective access to different files on a storage medium and is not a user entered identification code”. The argument is not understood.
22. Applicant further argues that *Brunt* also does not disclose map data but applicant failed to point out how this observation is relevant to the claim limitations.

23. Claims 1-21 and 23-45 have been examined.

Claim Objections

24. Claim 29 contains the duplicate word "identifier".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

25. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

26. Claims 24-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

27. Claim 1 added a limitation "individually checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium and a selected file from a group of files on the bulk storage medium".

28. It is not clear whether with this limitation applicant requires means for checking the use of the bulk storage medium as well as means for checking the use of a selected file from a group of files on the bulk storage medium or whether applicant's intention is directed towards the use of the medium and the file each time the use is attempted.

29. Claim 24 recites calculating a key (k) with a device identification number (ID) and first scrambled code (PIN), generating an identifier (AC) with the key (k) and a second scrambled code (ACW) then enabling access ... provided with a generated identifier for use by the computer system.

30. Claim 24 as written is not understood. It is not clear whether there are some missing steps or whether a relationship between a generated identifier that provides access to the selected group of files and the rest of the objects that are generated in the previous steps is missing.

31. Claim 24 has been amended to emphasize that a device identification number is used in calculating a key k "for the storage medium". Claims 27 and 34 were amended as well. Furthermore, in claim 27, in order to address 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph (in the previous Office Action), applicant removed the word "newly" from the original phrase: "is newly enabled".

The examiner points out that this amendment does not clarify the claim language. In essence claims 27 and 34 as cited suggest that enabling files results in a change of the device identification number (ID). However, the previously stated limitations of claim 24 suggest that the device identification number (ID) influences a process of enabling files (ID generates an identifier that enables access to a selected group of files). It is not clear whether applicant tries to emphasize that in order to enable different files a different device identification number is needed or whether that as soon as a file is enabled the device identification number is changed.

32. Also "a device identification number (ID) for the storage medium is not understood. It is not clear whether applicant attempts to put a limitation on a device identification number (ID) stating that it is "a storage medium device identification number" or whether applicant implies that the calculated key is for the storage medium. For purposes of further examination "the storage medium" is treated as referring to the

device identification number. However, the examiner also points out that the language as cited implies that "the storage medium" is directed only to an intended use of the device identification number and it is treated as such.

33. "The access authorization identifier" in claim 30 lacks antecedent basis.

34. Claims 2-21, 23, 25-26, 28-29 and 31-38 are rejected by virtue of their dependence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

35. Claims 39-41 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being as being anticipated by *Dietel (Operating Systems, 2nd Edition, 1990, ISBN: 0201180383)*.

36. As per claims 39-41 and 43-45 *Deitel* teaches identifiers (vectors) that are used by a file management system of a computer system to enable access to the selected group of files (*Fig. 13.7 Access Control Matrix, pg. 401*).

37. Furthermore, *Deitel* teaches encryption of sensitive information with encryption keys (*13.3 File System Functions (8), pg. 391*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

38. Claims 39-41 and 43-45 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wehrenberg et al. (International Pub. No. WO 97/44736)* in view of *Windows NT* as illustrated by *Jumes et al. (Jumes, Cooper, Chamoun and Feinman, "Microsoft Technical Reference, Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 Security, Audit and Control", 1999)*.

39. As per claims 39-41 and 43-45 *Wehrenberg et al.* teach a copy protection relevant to storage devices such as DVD and CD (*pg. 2 lines 28-32 and pg. 1 lines 30-34*) wherein data is in encrypted form in a hierarchical file structure (*pg. 3 lines 10-20*)

and wherein the files have an associated vector identifier that may be used to limit access (*SVE*, pg. 10 lines 22-29, Fig. 2b).

40. *Wehrenberg et al.* teach that each unit of data can be scrambled and encrypted using a key (pg. 3 lines 15-18).

41. *Wehrenberg et al.* do not teach storing a plurality of data files including a selected group of the plurality of data files.

42. *Windows NT* teaches storing a plurality of data files including a selected group of the plurality of data files (*Jumes et al.*, pg. 149, Table 9-6 and 9-8, pg. 149 and 151).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to extend *Wehrenberg et al.*'s invention to a plurality of data files including a selected group of the plurality of data files as taught by *Windows NT*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to limit access to the selected group of files.

44. Claims 24-26, 28-30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5598470) in view of *Windows NT* as illustrated by *Jumes et al.* (*Jumes, Cooper, Chamoun and Feinman, "Microsoft Technical Reference, Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 Security, Audit and Control", 1999*).

45. *Cooper et al.* teach a method for a key that is used to access a file as discussed in the previous Office Action.

46. *Cooper et al.* do not explicitly teach a key that is used to access the selected group of files.

Art Unit: 2134

47. *Windows NT* teaches that access can be administrated to the selected group of files (*directories permissions, Jumes et al., pg. 149, Table 9-6*).

48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to extend *Cooper et al.* invention to provide access to the selected group of files as taught by *Windows NT*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to control access to more than one file.

49. Also as per the new limitation pertaining to the intended use of the ID, the examiner points out that *Windows NT* involves "securing access to particular files which are stored in a computer-accessible memory media" (*Jumes et al., Abstract*) and as a result one could consider the ID recited in *Jumes et al.* as very much pertaining to (for) the storage medium. In addition it is old and well-known that computers are capable of generating identifications for the storage medium.

50. Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Windows NT* as illustrated by *Hadfield et al.* (Lee Hadfield, Dave Hater, Dave Bixler, "Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook", 1997, ISBN: 078971213) or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237).

51. As per claim 1 *Brunts et al.* teach a computer system in an automotive vehicle (col. 5 lines 51-60) utilizing memory and a processor (col. 3 line 57- col. 4 line 11), input

Art Unit: 2134

(objects 37, 16, 18, 20 etc., Fig. 2) and output (object 30, Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 objects 94, 96 etc.) units and data authorization (col. 7 lines 50-53).

52. *Brunts et al.* do not explicitly teach a means for individually checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium and a selected file from a group of files on the bulk storage medium.

53. *Hadfield et al.* teach individually checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium (pg. 168 and 166, log-on to a computer) and a selected file (pg. § 85, SID/ACE comparison) from a group of files on the bulk storage medium.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify *Brunts et al.*'s invention and to incorporate the modification as taught by *Hadfield et al.* to individually check authorized use of the bulk storage medium and a selected file from a group of files on the bulk storage medium. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to restrict access to the bulk storage medium to only authorized users and provide further authorization granularity to selected files on the bulk storage medium.

54. *TANAKA et al.* teach checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium ([1-6] and [82]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium as taught by *TANAKA et al.* and to incorporate it into *Brunts et al.*'s invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to prevent unauthorized use of the bulk storage medium.

55. As per claims 2 and 3 *Brunts et al.* teach encrypted information (*col. 7 lines 52-57*) and a decryption means for decrypting encrypted information (*claim 2 and Fig. 4 object 100*).
56. As per claims 4 and 6 *Brunts et al.* teach accessing authorized data information requiring a user to insert a memory card containing the data information into a memory card reader of a navigation system. The authorization code is checked against the card data identification code before allowing the user to access files (*col. 16 lines 13-39*).
57. As per claim 5 *Brunts et al.* teach that the identification code is encrypted (*col. 7 lines 52-55*).
58. As per claims 8 and 12 *Brunts et al.* teach a system identification number (*col. 3 lines 50-51*).
59. As per claim 18 *Brunts et al.* teach that the files are roadmap data (*destination related information, Abstract*).
60. As per claims 15-17 *Brunts et al.* teach an optical bulk storage medium (CD-ROM) (*col. 4 lines 15-17*).
- Brunts et al.* do not teach the optical bulk storage medium (CD-ROM) being implemented in all embodiments. *Brunts et al.* also do not teach use of DVD as the bulk storage medium.
61. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known practice to use DVD as a bulk storage medium. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to enhance *Brunts et al.*'s preferred embodiment to

include CD-ROM or DVD as bulk storage medium in order to increase the amount of choices for data storage.

62. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Hadfield et al.* and in further view of *Windows NT* and in further view of *Deitel* (H.M. Deitel, "Operating Systems", 2nd edition, 1990, ISBN: 0201180383) or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237).
63. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* teach the identifier as discussed above. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* do not teach a m-dimensional access authorization identifier, where m is the number of files stored on the bulk storage medium.
64. *Dietel* teaches m-dimensional access authorization identifiers, where m is the number of files stored on the bulk storage medium (*Dietel*, "Access Control Matrix" section and Fig. 13.7 pg. 400-401). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use a m-dimensional access authorization identifier, where m is the number of files stored on the bulk storage medium as taught by *Dietel*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to control access to each file.
65. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237) and in further view of *Dreifus* (U.S. Patent No. 4575621).

66. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or *Tanaka et al* teach the device identifier as discussed above. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or *Tanaka et al* do not explicitly teach that the device identifier can be automatically changed.

Dreifus teaches the device identifier that can be changed (*Dreifus*, col. 17 lines 39-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention modify *Brunts et al.* to use a device identifier that can be changed automatically as taught by *Dreifus*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to increase security (*Dreifus*, col. 17 lines 32-43).

67. Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Windows NT* as illustrated by *Jumes et al.* (*Jumes, Cooper, Chamoun and Feinman, "Microsoft Technical Reference, Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 Security, Audit and Control", 1999*) or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237).

68. As per claims 19 and 21 *Brunts et al.* teach a mobile radio network communication (*GPS, Abstract*).

69. *Brunts et al.* do not explicitly teach a connection to a communication means which permits communication with a central station in which the user rights on the files are managed.

70. *Jumes et al.* teach a connection to a communication means that permits communication with a central station in which the user rights on the files are managed (pg. 10 "Domain Controller" section and pg. 13, "Workstation" section).

71. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify *Brunts et al.* invention to include a connection (such as a mobile radio network) to a communication means that permits communication with a central station in which the user rights on the files are managed as taught by *Jumes et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to provide stronger security control (pg. 13, "Workstation" section).
72. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Windows NT* as illustrated by *Jumes et al.* (*Jumes, Cooper, Chamoun and Feinman, "Microsoft Technical Reference, Microsoft Windows NT 4.0 Security, Audit and Control", 1999*) or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237) and in further view of *O'Neill, Jr.* (U.S. Patent No. 6069588).
73. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* teach the communication as discussed above.
74. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* do not teach that the communication takes place via a short-haul radio link.
75. *O'Neill, Jr.* teaches communication taking place via a short-haul radio link (*Abstract*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* to employ a short-haul radio link communication as taught by *O'Neill*,

Jr. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to take advantage of short-range, ad hoc networks (*Abstract*).

76. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237) in further view of *Parnian et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6538623).

77. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* teach the computer system as discussed above.

78. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* do not teach voice input means.

79. *Parnian et al.* teach voice input means (*Parnian et al.*, col. 9 lines 29-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include voice input means as taught by *Parnian et al.* into *Brunts et al.*'s invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to minimize the use of hands (*Parnian et al.*, col. 4 lines 5-9).

80. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brunts et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5887269) in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237) and in further view of *Shuman et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6161071).

81. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* teach the system as discussed above.

82. *Brunts et al.* in view of *Windows NT* or alternatively in view of *TANAKA et al.* do not teach that the system is designed to receive and process traffic information.

83. *Shuman et al.* teach that the system is designed to receive and process traffic information (*Shuman et al.*, col. 20 lines 34-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to enhance *Brunts et al.*'s system by designing the system to receive and process traffic information as taught by *Shuman et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to select the most preferable route (*Shuman et al.*, col. 20 lines 37-41).

84. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5598470) in view of *Dreifus* (U.S. Patent No. 4575621).

85. As per claim 27 *Cooper et al.* teach the device identifier as discussed above.

Cooper et al. does not explicitly teach that the device identifier is changed whenever another file on the storage medium is newly enabled.

Dreifus teaches the device identifier that changed continuously (*Dreifus*, col. 17 lines 39-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to change the device identifier continuously as taught by *Dreifus*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to increase security (*Dreifus*, col. 17 lines 32-43).

86. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5598470) in view of *Steinberg* (U.S. Pub. No. 20030159042).

87. *Cooper et al.* teach files as discussed above. *Cooper et al.* do not teach that the files contain application programs.

Steinberg teaches the files that contain application programs (Steinberg, Abstract and [0017]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include the files that contain application programs as taught by Steinberg into *Cooper et al.*'s invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to customize the invention for a particular user.

88. Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5598470) in view of *Keller* (Robert M. Keller, "Complexity", <http://www.cs.hmc.edu/claremont/keller/webBook/ch11/>).

89. *Cooper et al.* teach the key and the identifier (AC) as discussed above.

Cooper et al. do not teach an identifier (AC) having m components $a(1)$, $a(2)$, $a(3)$ that are used to determine the position of a file $D(x)$ in the hierarchical file structure such that all the components of the identifier (AC(x)) which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is hierarchically dependent take a first value, while all the remaining components, which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is not hierarchically dependent, take a second value.

Keller teach an identifier having m components $a(1)$, $a(2)$, $a(3)$ that are used to determine the position of a file $D(x)$ in the hierarchical file structure such that all the components of the identifier (AC(x)) which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is hierarchically dependent take a first value, while all the remaining components,

which are allocated to files on which the file D(x) is not hierarchically dependent, take a second value (*Keller, "Binary Search Trees" and "Bit Vectors" sections*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use in *Cooper et al.*'s invention an identifier having *m* components a(1), a(2), a(3) that are used to determine the position of a file D(x) in the hierarchical file structure such that all the components of the identifier (AC(x)) which are allocated to files on which the file D(x) is hierarchically dependent take a first value, while all the remaining components, which are allocated to files on which the file D(x) is not hierarchically dependent, take a second value. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to increase the speed of the file D(x) retrieval (*Keller, "Bit Vectors" sections*).

90. Claims 1, 10-11 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5598470) in view of *Kashiwazaki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4891760) and in further view of *TANAKA et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20010011237) or alternatively in further view of *Windows NT* as illustrated by *Hadfield et al.* (Lee Hadfield, Dave Hater, Dave Bixler, "Windows NT Server 4 Security Handbook", 1997, ISBN: 078971213).
91. *Cooper et al.* in view *Kashiwazaki et al.* teach a method and system for enabling access to files as discussed in the previous Office Action.
92. *Cooper et al.* in view *Kashiwazaki et al.* do not explicitly teach checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium.

93. *TANAKA et al.* teach checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium ([1-6] and [82]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium as taught by *TANAKA et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to prevent unauthorized use of the bulk storage medium.

94. Also, *Hadfield et al.* teach individually checking authorized use of the bulk storage medium (pg. 168 and 166, log-on to a computer) and a selected file (pg. § 85, *SID/ACE comparison*) from a group of files on the bulk storage medium.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to individually check authorized use of the bulk storage medium and a selected file from a group of files on the bulk storage medium as taught by *Hadfield et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to restrict access to the bulk storage medium to only authorized users and provide further authorization granularity to selected files on the bulk storage medium.

95. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wehrenberg et al.* (International Pub. No. WO 97/44736) in view of *Keller* (Robert M. Keller, "Complexity", <http://www.cs.hmc.edu/claremont/keller/webBook/ch11/>).

96. *Wehrenberg et al.* teach the storage medium and the vector as discussed above.

Wehrenberg et al. do not teach a storage medium that have m components $a(1)$, $a(2)$, $a(3)$ of the vector $AC(x)$ that are used to characterize a position of a file $D(x)$ in the hierarchical file structure such that all the components of the vector $AC(x)$ which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is hierarchically dependent take a first value, while all the remaining components, which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is not hierarchically dependent, take a second value.

Keller teach m components $a(1)$, $a(2)$, $a(3)$ of the vector $AC(x)$ that are used to characterize a position of a file $D(x)$ in the hierarchical file structure such that all the components of the vector $AC(x)$ which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is hierarchically dependent take a first value, while all the remaining components, which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is not hierarchically dependent, take a second value (*Keller*, "Binary Search Trees" and "Bit Vectors" sections).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement in *Wehrenberg et al.*'s invention m components $a(1)$, $a(2)$, $a(3)$ of a vector $AC(x)$ that are used to characterize a position of a file $D(x)$ in the hierarchical file structure such that all the components of the vector $AC(x)$ which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is hierarchically dependent take a first value, while all the remaining components, which are allocated to files on which the file $D(x)$ is not hierarchically dependent, take a second value as taught by *Keller*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to increase speed of the file $D(x)$ retrieval (*Keller*, "Bit Vectors" sections).

Conclusion

The limitations of claim 34 would overcome the art of record if a device identification number (ID) was "a storage medium device identification number (ID)". Applicant is reminded that the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejections need to be appropriately addressed. No new matter may be added.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571)272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Art Unit: 2134

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).


Signature

Date


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100